# J44ACASCps UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 19-cr-193 (DLC) V. RICHARD CASTRO and 5 LUIS FERNANDEZ, 6 Defendants. Conference 7 -----x 8 New York, N.Y. 9 April 4, 2019 3:40 p.m. 10 Before: 11 12 HON. DENISE L. COTE 13 District Judge 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York 17 BY: ALINE R. FLODR, ESQ. RYAN B. FINKEL, ESQ. 18 Assistant United States Attorneys 19 O'BRIEN HATFIELD, P.A. Attorneys for Defendant Castro 20 BY: MARK J. O'BRIEN, ESQ. 21 DONALD H. VOGELMAN, ESQ. Attorney for Defendant Fernandez 22 23 Also Present: Joseph J. Azzata Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation 24 Mohammed Ahmed 25 Pretrial Services Officer

1 (Case called)

THE CLERK: Is the government ready to proceed?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. Aline Flodr and Ryan Finkel on behalf of the United States. And with us at counsel table is Special Agent Joseph Azzata.

THE CLERK: Thank you.

For the defendant, Richard Castro, are you ready to proceed?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, your Honor. May it please the Court, my name is Mark O'Brien. Seated to my right, your left, is Richard Castro.

THE CLERK: Thank you. For the defendant, Luis Fernandez, are you ready to proceed?

MR. VOGELMAN: Yes, your Honor. My name is Donald Vogelman. I represent Luis Fernandez. And he is seated to my right. Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. Just give me one minute here.

Mr. Vogelman, your name isn't on my appearance sheet.

Is there a reason for that?

MR. VOGELMAN: I filed a notice of appearance through ECF, and I have confirmation of that. I just was retained yesterday. I also work — in my suite is Andrew Mancilla and Robert Fantone. They're two lawyers that actually, when I was retained, they met with the family and they filed notices also

in this case. But I'm going to be the lead attorney and I did file a notice.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you. My deputy has checked. We have the other names but not yours. But she has checked on ECF and we now have a record of it. Thank you.

MR. VOGELMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: OK. I'll take a report from you, Ms. Flodr.

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. This case concerns a conspiracy that existed between on or about November 2015 and until March 2019. And it consisted of Mr. Castro and Mr. Fernandez conspiring to distribute carfentanyl, fentanyl, and phenyl fentanyl, which are some of the most dangerous opioids sold today. Fentanyl is an opioid that is much more powerful than heroin. And carfentanyl is a fentanyl analogue that is approximately a hundred times more potent then fentanyl and approximately one thousand times more powerful than heroin.

The conspiracy dealt these drugs in two ways. First, they sold drugs over the dark web, over dark web marketplaces that are consistent with like Amazon except operating on the dark web. And, second, they shifted it off of these dark web marketplaces and started to take drug orders over e-mail, specifically an encrypted e-mail address.

For most of this period, the conspiracy dealt drugs using the monikers Chemsusa, Chems underscore usa, and Chemical

underscore usa. Defendant Richard Castro was an online operator of these monikers and was paid in bitcoin for the narcotics that he was selling.

On one dark net marketplace, Dream Market, Chemsusa boasted that it had sold and completed more than 3200 narcotics transactions over dark web marketplaces, including 1800 over AlphaBay. In June 2018, Chemsusa informed its customers on Dream Market that he was moving its business off of these dark net marketplaces and would start accepting purchases only through an encrypted e-mail address. To learn that off market e-mail address, Chemsusa required willing customers from these marketplaces to pay a fee. An undercover law enforcement agent participating in our investigation paid that fee, obtained that encrypted e-mail address, and then started placing orders with Castro through that e-mail address.

Castro's co-conspirator here, Mr. Fernandez, shipped narcotics on behalf of the conspiracy, including from New York City.

From November 2018 to the beginning of March 2019, at least 94 packages have been linked to this conspiracy. Several of them have been searched through search warrants and have now tested positive for carfentanyl or fentanyl.

Fernandez was caught on video dropping off some of these packages in December of 2018. All of these packages were shipped through the U.S. Postal Service using USPS Priority

Mail envelopes. And for most of them the sender's purported return address was a law office or a governmental entity, which we believe was meant to prevent holders of those packages from opening those packages for fear that it might contain privileged material or otherwise confidential material.

THE COURT: Did you say the return addresses were?

MS. FLODR: The purported sender addresses, your

Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. FLODR: Using the mail in this way exposed many innocent parties to unknowingly handle these packages without knowing the full dangerous contents that were inside of these packages. Castro also laundered his narcotics proceeds, including by funneling more than approximately \$1.7 million through several bitcoin wallets he owned, and by buying valuables which were shipped to his residence in Florida.

Castro was arrested on March 12, 2019 in Florida. A search of his home revealed approximately nine guns, including a gun in his bedroom, and approximately \$17,000 in cash, also found in his bedroom. A search of his office in that same home revealed a remaining eight guns, near two safes, and in those safes were private keys to multiple bitcoin wallets.

THE COURT: So nine guns plus eight guns, are you saying?

MS. FLODR: It was nine guns in total, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. FLODR: Some of these guns were AR-15s, and at least one gun was an illegal firearm.

Castro's guns, the government proffers, were believed to have protected his drug proceeds.

Fernandez was also arrested on March 12th, 2019 after voluntarily surrendering. A search of Fernandez's mother's apartment, where Fernandez resided, revealed labels consistent with the names and addresses of customers of the conspiracy, 88 grams of substances that field tested positive for fentanyl, and 26 grams of substances that field tested positive for cocaine.

There was an additional 582 grams of substances found in Fernandez's room in that apartment, which the agents also believed to be consistent with narcotics, but that 582 grams has yet to be tested.

Lastly, the agents also recovered a gun from the apartment which a witness in the apartment indicated belonged to Mr. Fernandez.

On the same day that Castro and Fernandez were arrested, law enforcement approached over a dozen individuals who were believed to be customers of the conspiracy. Evidence obtained from statements and documents from those customers show that those customers bought carfentanyl, fentanyl, and phenyl fentanyl from Chemsusa through dark web marketplaces,

and then, as with the undercover agent, transitioned to buying those same types of drugs from the conspiracy through the encrypted e-mail address, the same encrypted e-mail address that had been provided to the undercover agent.

Castro and Fernandez were indicted on March 19, 2019, in a three-count indictment, and this Court granted an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from March 22, 2019 through today's conference. At most, by the government's calculation, three days have elapsed off of the Speedy Trial clock.

THE COURT: And I believe we put the conference over until today so that the defendant, who was arrested in Florida, could arrive in the district and counsel could be present for him. Am I correct?

MS. FLODR: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good.

If this case went to trial, how long does the government expect the trial would last?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, the government approximates about one and a half to two weeks for the government's case.

THE COURT: And in addition to what you have described already in setting forth the case, what are any other sources of evidence, principal sources of the evidence that the government expects to offer at trial?

MS. FLODR: In addition to the types of evidence

already described, there is also GPS location data and
telephone records for each of the defendants. The government
is also waiting on the returns of a multi a treaty request
for assistance from Finland regarding a cryptocurrency exchange
that Mr. Castro was believed to have used in order to
facilitate receiving narcotics proceeds and laundering those
proceeds. And in addition, through all of the premises
searches that we have completed, we have at this point seized
many, many electronic devices that will need to be imaged and
will need to be reviewed pursuant to the search warrants under
which those items were seized.

And lastly, your Honor, we have also obtained search warrants on an e-mail account associated with Mr. Castro, and the return from that search would also be principal evidence that the government would rely on at trial.

THE COURT: Were there post-arrest statements?

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, Mr. Castro did not make any post-arrest statements, but Mr. Fernandez did, after he was Mirandized and waived his *Miranda* rights.

THE COURT: Let me begin by arraigning the defendants on the indictment. I believe it bears the number 19-cr-193. Is that correct, counsel?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I would ask both defendants, please, to stand. I'm

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to ask you three questions: have you received a copy of the indictment; do you wish me to read it to you; how do you plead, guilty or not guilty.

So I will begin with you, Mr. Castro. Have you received a copy of the indictment, 19-cr-193?

DEFENDANT CASTRO: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Fernandez?

DEFENDANT FERNANDEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Castro, do you wish me to read it to you?

DEFENDANT CASTRO: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Fernandez?

DEFENDANT FERNANDEZ: No.

THE COURT: Mr. Castro, how do you plead? Guilty or not guilty?

DEFENDANT CASTRO: Not guilty.

THE COURT: Mr. Fernandez, how do you plead? Guilty or not guilty?

DEFENDANT FERNANDEZ: Not guilty.

THE COURT: You may be seated.

So have counsel discussed a schedule for trial?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. We have conferred before today's conference, and while the parties agree that a trial date the second week of November would work for all parties, it's the government's understanding that the defense would

prefer the end of January of 2020.

THE COURT: So when in November? I'm sorry?

MS. FLODR: The second week of November.

THE COURT: Well, the second week in November begins on November 11th. That's a court holiday. So the trial will begin on November 12th. But I understand, I think I understand from the government, that the defendants would prefer not to go to trial in November. They would prefer to go to trial early next year.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, as to Mr. Castro -- my name is Mark O'Brien -- I am ready in November. I am also, at the Court's convenience, ready in January of 2020.

MR. VOGELMAN: Your Honor, I did speak to the government and Ms. O'Brien, and honestly January is much better because my daughter is getting married December 14th. My wife and I are throwing the wedding. I'm being honest with the Court. A lot of people are coming in from out of town. And since there's voluminous discovery in this case, I want to be able to prepare, if it goes to trial. And I don't want to feel squeezed, as this is a case where there's a lot of evidence that people have. And I discussed this with my client, who right now is incarcerated. I've discussed this with co-counsel and the government. So I'm giving you the most honest answer I can. I would really rather go in January for that reason.

THE COURT: OK. Well, I appreciate that. And

congratulations on your daughter's wedding. But it's December. And this is going to be a short trial. And you're choosing a period of time where you're expecting the trial to be over before Thanksgiving. Otherwise we would start the week before. We would start the first week in November. So my understanding from counsel is, they expect this trial to be done by November 22nd. Otherwise we're going to start November 4th.

MS. FLODR: Your Honor, the only -- the government is prepared to go to trial earlier in November as well. We just understood that the second week of November was what was preferred for defense counsel, and given that our estimation of the trial schedule doesn't take into account any defense case or whether there will be expert testimony from the defense side, and some of this evidence, as defense counsel has stated, is quite complicated and it will take a fair amount of educating the jury about it.

THE COURT: Well, counsel know better than I do about, you know, what their plans are for this trial. So I'm happy to give you a November trial. I'm going to give you a November trial. I am happy to start it on Tuesday, November 12, if you can represent to me in good faith that the jury will be able to deliver a verdict by November 22nd. Otherwise we're going to start on November 4th.

MS. FLODR: Out of an abundance of caution, I think we would prefer November 4th, your Honor.

THE COURT: That sounds right to me.

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, Mark O'Brien on behalf of Mr. Castro. I am ready to go November 4th.

THE COURT: And it's better for the wedding.

MR. VOGELMAN: Judge, you know, I'm just telling you the honest truth, what my strong preference was. If we're going to go in November, November 4th is fine, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you so much. And I'm glad you have, obviously, co-counsel available who have filed notices of appearance in this case to help you with the burden of the trial.

So we'll have the trial November 4th.

What I'll probably plan to do is sit five days that first week, because the next Monday is a holiday. So we'll have a short week the second week. But we'll sit five days that first week.

I don't know if there's going to be a need for hearings here. I don't know what kind of motions might be made. What I'm thinking about is setting a motion schedule for July, which would permit us, then, to have any hearings, if we need hearings, in August, and then give you plenty of time to prepare for trial, knowing what evidence was in, what evidence was out. I am happy to set a motion schedule, push it back closer to trial if you prefer. But I guess I need guidance from defense counsel what you'd like.

MR. VOGELMAN: Your Honor, the government told us that there is voluminous discovery, and they just stated on the record that they have to get search warrant analysis, look at computers and phones. And government told me it might be six to eight weeks before we receive all the discovery. It's going to be rolling. I think they might have some this week.

If I do ask for a hearing -- from what I heard, my client made post-arrest statements. We might ask for a hearing, we might not. I just got retained on the case. So I think, since we might not have all the discovery until May or June, maybe we should have motions in August or September, maybe August, not July. I just don't want to, you know, be squeezed when we get all our discovery, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. O'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: Your Honor, I would concur. I would suggest a deadline for motions in August, along with any hearing date scheduled for September.

THE COURT: OK. Fine.

So we'll have motions due August 9th, government's response August 16th.

Now, I want the defendants to understand, this is a firm trial date. It's not going to move. If at any time you have an inability to pay for counsel or want to retain other counsel, you have to move expeditiously and make that decision promptly, so that incoming counsel has an adequate time to

learn your case and prepare for trial. Do you understand what I've just said, Mr. Castro?

DEFENDANT CASTRO: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Fernandez?

DEFENDANT FERNANDEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Because both defendants were arrested, they were advised of their rights already.

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

So we have chosen a trial date of November 4th. Is there any objection to an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act until our trial date?

MR. O'BRIEN: On behalf of Mr. Richard Castro, no, your Honor.

MR. VOGELMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I exclude time from today until November 4th under the Speedy Trial Act, finding that it's supported by the interests of justice and outweighs the best interest of the defendants in a public and a Speedy Trial. It will permit discovery to be made and evaluated, permit defendants if they wish to enter pleas of guilty, to negotiate those with the government. If they prefer to go to trial, it will permit time for those motions to be made and decided by the Court and for everyone to prepare for trial. I make this exclusion pursuant to Title 18

United States Code § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Give me a schedule, will you, Ms. Flodr, for production of discovery.

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. The government expects that within six to eight weeks we will substantially complete all of our discovery, aside from the treaty returns that I mentioned earlier from Finland, which I understand from the Office of International Affairs could take at least another four months for us to receive. As soon as we receive those returns, we will provide them to defense counsel.

And in addition, the six to eight weeks does account for the fact that we will be able to image all of the computer devices that we have seized pursuant to search warrants within that time frame and provide all of those images to Mr. Castro, who those devices are all associated with. But we, given that we do not know at this time exactly the volume of the data on these devices, we cannot estimate at this time how long it will take to review all of the data off of those 24 devices that we have seized.

THE COURT: So do you require the defendants to provide you with hard drives for the information that is being placed on it?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. And we already have an initial round of discovery for defendants today. We have received a hard drive from Mr. Castro, and I understand we're

2.2

going to receive one from Mr. Fernandez's counsel as well. So we will be very quickly able to start providing the remainder of the discovery. But as of today we do have discs available for defense counsel.

MR. VOGELMAN: Your Honor, I have a hard drive in my brief case. I will give it to the government as soon as the proceeding is over.

THE COURT: OK. Good.

So I expect discovery to be completed by May 24th.

The government is to make production of discovery on a rolling basis so that it goes to the defendants as quickly as possible. And the exception will be the production from Finland or anything not currently in the government's possession. It will promptly make production of materials that come into its possession later.

Anything else, Ms. Flodr, we should address?

MS. FLODR: Yes, your Honor. We have conferred with the defense counsel on a proposed protective order for certain of the discovery in this case. I have a copy that I can hand up to your Honor for your Honor's review.

THE COURT: Great.

So I have signed the protective order.

Anything else, Mr. O'Brien?

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, as to the matters discussed to this point, no, your Honor. We did file an application for

1 bond.

THE COURT: OK. I will certainly address that.

And for you, Mr. Vogelman, anything else?

MR. VOGELMAN: Judge, as you know, I was just recently retained. My client's mother and brother and other family members are in court. I'm going to speak to them. If we can put together a bail package, I will speak to the U.S. Attorney about what we can do about that, Judge. So I'm reserving an application at this time.

THE COURT: That's fine. The defendant is remanded without prejudice to a future application for bail.

MR. VOGELMAN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Good.

So you are dismissed, Mr. Vogelman and Mr. Fernandez, and I will address the bail application on behalf of Mr. Castro.

MR. VOGELMAN: Thank you for your courtesy, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

THE COURT: OK. I have the Pretrial Services Officer report, and it includes an addendum. The addendum is dated April 4th, and it attaches an underlying report from March 12th. And it recommends release of the defendant on a bond under certain conditions. I have a motion for a bond filed

April 3rd by defense counsel.

Is there consent to release on bond?

MR. FINKEL: No, your Honor. The government seeks detention in this case.

THE COURT: And this is Mr. Finkel?

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, of course this is a presumption case, because Mr. Castro is charged with dealing fentanyl, fentanyl analogues of (b)(1)(A) weight, and also charged with using a firearm in connection with those crimes.

But even if this were not a presumption case, I submit to you this would be a very close case -- a very simple case, in which only remand is appropriate. There are no conditions that could satisfy this Court that the community will be safe and that the defendant will return to court when asked.

My colleague, Ms. Flodr, went through the details of the case, which are also laid out in a 20-page complaint, which show that Mr. Castro was the boss of a very sophisticated, carefully planned, deceptive dark web ring that sold some of the most dangerous substances that are available. Carfentanyl is typically used on large mammals, such as elephants, and that's what was shipped in the mail, at Mr. Castro's direction, by people located here in New York City. By doing this, Mr. Castro generated, as is reported in the complaint, more than \$1.7 million worth of bitcoin.

So I would like to address first the risk of flight, which is substantial here. Mr. Castro has the means and the motive and, if he is to be released, would have the opportunity to flee.

Let me focus on the means first. As I mentioned, the government has learned that millions of dollars of bitcoin have flowed through his accounts to him. He lived in a mansion down in Windermere in Florida, surrounded by his luxury cars, yet he had no job.

And the kind of money he has, the bitcoins, are a special consideration. This is a cash that needs to be transported in a suitcase or even through a bank account.

Bitcoins exist everywhere and nowhere. They can be accessed from anyplace on the planet that has Internet access. So there's no way that his money could be trapped. There's no way that he could be trapped. And especially here, in a situation where he was able to evade law enforcement for years by using sophisticated computer techniques, he has the means to hide. He has the means to flee. This is not the normal actor. This is not a normal defendant.

And because he was working on the dark web, not only does he know how to distribute drugs in a subtle -- in a secretive way, but he also probably has the way to obtain fake documents, fake passports, aliases, Social Security numbers, from anyplace on the planet, because that's what the dark web

has. That's what the dark web has access to. And he knows how it works, because he was one of the most prolific vendors on the dark web for years.

In fact, he deliberately chose — the encrypted e-mail service that Ms. Flodr referenced before is based in Switzerland. It boasts that it's outside the jurisdiction of the United States and outside the jurisdiction of the EU. He chose that e-mail service purposely. He chose it to evade detection. That's what he does. He evades detection.

So a GPS bracelet, a family member who will retain custody of him, none of that is enough. None of that is sufficient.

So let's look at the motive here. The defendant is now facing a 15-year mandatory minimum. Even under the a guidelines as calculated by defense counsel in his brief, he's looking at a guidelines range of 108 to 135 months, plus the 924(c) man. min., 168 months. Mr. Castro is 36. He has spent no significant time in prison and he's now looking at at least 15 years.

The motive here is powerful, especially given the evidence that the government now has. When the government put together its complaint, I submit to you, your Honor, the case was pretty strong. It has gotten stronger, based on the search warrants that have been executed, based on the conversations that Ms. Flodr referenced with the customers of the defendant.

And just recently, your Honor, based on a search warrant returned from Mr. Castro's iCloud account, the account that is hooked into his cellphone, the cellphone that was found on him on the day he was arrested, in his photo library, next to pictures of his children, next to pictures of him and his common-law wife, were addresses of the recipients of some of the packages that the government is aware that Mr. Fernandez sent.

In other words, your Honor, the FBI and law enforcement officers have spoken to the people in his phone, whose addresses were in his phone, next to language that says "50 mg rhino," or "250 mg rhino." Clearly a reference to drugs. It's essentially a smoking gun.

Now it is true, of course, that the defendant has family in the United States. He has some connection to the United States. But he has the means to flee and then send for his family later. \$1.7 million is enough to do that. It's enough to pay back his family members should the government seize the property that Mr. Castro's attorney said should be put up as collateral.

And then we should also look at Mr. Castro's history. He has one arrest and one misdemeanor conviction for reckless driving, 2008. And for that minor charge, two bench warrants were issued. When facing a misdemeanor, two bench warrants were issued. He's now facing four extraordinarily serious

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

felonies and a 15-year mandatory minimum.

With respect to danger to the community, the nature of this crime is significant, your Honor. As I mentioned and Ms. Flodr has mentioned, the substances that were sent through the mail, at his direction, are extraordinarily dangerous, and they posed a danger to every community that these letters flowed through, communities throughout the entire United States, where customers were in Hawaii, where customers were in California, in New York, in Florida, in Louisiana, everywhere. Every postal carrier who carried those package was exposed. Every innocent person who picked up the package for their friend or their neighbor was exposed. And there is no condition, none, that this Court can impose that can prevent the defendant from continuing to commit his crimes, because all he needs is a cellphone. That's how he operated his drug ring, through a cellphone. And there is nothing, nothing that this Court can do, short of asking him not to commit crimes, that will prevent him.

In addition to the drugs, your Honor, there is the guns. There were nine weapons found in his home, eight of which appear to be legal. But the ninth one was not. And that's this gun, your Honor. And I can pass this up if you'd like. This is a modified assault weapon that, under the National Firearms Act, should be registered. It was not registered, at all. He had an arsenal in his house, used —

apparently there to protect himself, to protect the currency that was in his house, the precious metal that was in his house, and the bitcoin wallets, the bitcoin accounts, the passwords.

Now, your Honor, I understand that pretrial has recommended release with conditions. I submit to you that, in this case, pretrial — they usually get it right — in this case they got it wrong. The defendant is the head of an extremely sophisticated and dangerous dark web ring. The community can't be safe. And there's no guarantee that this Court can be satisfied that he will return, unless he's remanded.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MR. O'BRIEN: May it please the Court, Judge, the first thing that I would like to do is point out that present behind me in the second and third rows of the center part of the courtroom are members of my client's family. In particular his mother is present and his father is present.

I have not had the privilege of appearing before your Honor before, so I do not know if you'll allow me to proffer what I propose or if you wish to take testimony if your Honor is considering a third-party custodian, but they are present.

Judge, what I would proffer is contained in the motion that I filed yesterday. And I do note, Judge, that I had that motion prepared for some time. I was simply waiting to be

allowed to file on ECF because Mr. Quijano filed a motion to allow me to appeal pro hac vice, which was granted yesterday. The moment that was granted, we filed the motion. So I don't want the Court to think that we were sitting on this and sandbagging anyone.

I also presented to Pretrial Services and the government on Monday the two pieces of collateral which I believe your Honor has seen at this point. If not, Pretrial Services have a copy. I have a copy. And I could certainly pass that up for your Honor's review.

Judge, I'll start --

THE COURT: You know, I'm not sure what you are referring to when you say "the two pieces of collateral."

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, I have in my hands, and if your Honor will allow me to pass them up, I have the two pieces of properties that I have offered as collateral. They are set forth in my motion, but I did not put them as an attachment because of the personal identification information contained --

THE COURT: Sure. You can hand those up to my deputy.

MR. O'BRIEN: May I approach?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. O'BRIEN: And I'm showing opposing counsel the two pieces of property that I had previously provided both pretrial and the government.

Showing Pretrial Services.

THE COURT: So these are two sets of documents that have pictures of and distribute information about two pieces of property. One is in Windermere, Florida. And the other is in St. Cloud, Florida.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, your Honor. The St. Cloud property is owned by Nelson Castro, who is -- Mr. Castro, if you could just stand up so the judge can see you.

Judge, he's in the front row from your vantage point on your left. Mr. Castro owns that property. He lives there with his wife. It does have the mortgage, as you see, that has been attached to that document. However, Judge, that is his only residence. Should that residence be taken from him, he would officially be homeless.

As to the Windermere property, that belongs to his mother. She is sitting to Mr. Castro's left from your vantage point. That is Maria Castro. That is her retirement property. She is at the tail end of a very proud career serving a state court criminal judge as a judicial assistant. When she retires, which is going to be fairly soon, she is going to retire to Windermere, Florida, and live in that property. She owns that property outright, Judge. There are no encumbrances. And that is also set forth in the documents that we provided to the county appraiser.

Judge, both of those properties total about, by my bad math and according to Zillow, which is an online real estate

tool that provides estimates of value, we're looking at -ma'am and sir, you may sit -- we're looking at about 560 to 600
thousand dollars. Now, in terms of equity, we probably have
about two thirds of that, because, again, Mr. Castro's house is
mortgaged, while Ms. Castro's home is owned outright.

Judge, he has strong family support, meaning Richard Castro, has strong family support, both in New York and in Florida. Present are folks from New York. He has folks in Florida that could not travel up here due to work purposes and school purposes.

I would note that his family, meaning his longtime domestic partner -- he calls her his wife. They've been together since they were 13 years old. They share four children together. There is one on the way. His wife is due sometime in July of 2019. They are all school-age children. If your Honor were to grant release, we would be very appreciative. If your Honor were to grant release and ask us where we would prefer that he live, obviously I would prefer, from a professional standpoint, that he live in Florida. I have a main office in Tampa, a satellite office in Orlando. He is almost splitting the difference, in terms of getting to either location, based on either location that he can live in Florida.

I also would note, Judge, that if your Honor were to grant his release -- and we're not assuming that you are -- but if you were to grant his release, I would submit to the Court

that he has a lot of family in Florida that can keep an eye on him. He also has, again, four school-age children. We would hate for them to have to leave school and move to New York midway through the school year. Or, in the alternative, we would hate for Mr. Castro to be separated from his family.

I would note, Judge, that, in terms of this case -and I was candid with the Court in my motion, and I know your
Honor read it -- I have yet, in 17 years of practicing in
federal court, heard a prosecutor say that their case is not
strong. And this case is no different.

I will also submit, because I want to earn credibility before this Court, it appears their case is fairly strong.

Count Four they may have an issue with, in terms of these guns, because Mr. Castro is not a felon. In the State of Florida, he is allowed to buy guns. He belonged to the Orlando Gun Club, and he was and avid gun collector. He liked to go shoot guns.

The government has made the argument that these guns were necessary to protect his drug money, essentially. And in the typical case that may be correct, but in this case the government has already told your Honor that this is cryptocurrency. The government admittedly stated he's not running around with bags or suitcases full of money. There were \$7,000 in cash in his house. I submit to the Court that, while \$7,000 is certainly nothing to sneeze at, it does not take an arsenal to protect. I submit to the Court it is more

likely that Mr. Castro simply liked guns. He was lawfully allowed to have guns, and in the State of Florida, when you legally purchase the guns, that is acceptable. He had a carry, his carry concealed firearm permit, which I know is a bit different from state to state. It is not an open carry. It is a concealed carry. But he had that. That is not in dispute, I don't believe, by either party.

So I also submit to you, Judge -- and I was candid with the Court in my analysis of the guidelines -- there are significant penalties in this case. But in my opinion, your Honor, that is cause for him to, should he not opt for trial -- the only way -- and this Court knows this, the government knows this, and I know this, and Mr. Castro is aware of it because I have informed him -- there is only one way that he can get below a mandatory minimum penalty. And because of his role in the offense and the firearm, it is not the safety valve. And everyone in this courtroom knows what I'm referring to, which is the only way left.

So I believe, your Honor, it is in his best interest to make sure that he abides by all the terms and conditions of this Court, should it grant release, because he may be in a position, if he wants to do one day less than 180 months, he may have to try to please the government going forward.

Now, we haven't reached that stage yet. I don't have one piece of discovery. But I have been doing this a while.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I can look at a case on its face and realize that we have an uphill battle.

I would also submit to the Court that, in terms of the risk of flight -- which, along with dangerousness to the community, is really the two big factors here today. Let's talk about risk of flight for a moment. The government has emphasized that he had \$1.7 million worth of bitcoin. But what the government didn't mention is that bitcoin has fallen in its value in recent months. And while at one point at its height it was, I believe, one bitcoin was worth approximately \$22,000, I believe if you look now, it's less than \$4,000. So I dispute that right now currently he has somewhere, in this cryptocurrency world, almost \$2 million, which he can take, access all these fake documents, and travel someplace where there is no extradition. I think that that's a little foolish The gig is up for him. He is not a mastermind at this point. criminal with a history of doing horrible things.

In the light most favorable to the government, if he committed the crimes as alleged, that is now over. And I will say to the Court that that is supported by the fact that the government has seized the -- in the course of their search warrants, the only way he can access the cryptocurrency has been taken by the government. He has no access to any money, no matter what the value is. If it's 1.7 million or something less, as I proffered to the Court, he does not have access to

l it.

2.2

I will also say that his parents --

THE COURT: Now, explain to me why that's so.

MR. O'BRIEN: It gets complicated, Judge, but in the cryptocurrency world, it's kind of -- I don't want to say it's make-believe money, but it's money that's often in the cyber world. It's not tangible. In other words, if he was perhaps a drug trafficker in the old-fashioned use of that term, he would have 1.7 million in cash lining his refrigerator or microwave or hidden underneath the bed or whatever stash house or secret compartments in a vehicle. That's not what the government is alleging in this case. They're alleging that all of his money was through cryptocurrency, bitcoins and other currency.

Because the government seized his ability to access the web with what it takes to go online and make transfers or make withdrawals, he doesn't have the ability to log in and access that money anymore. It's as if they seized the cash when they arrested him and conducted the search warrant.

THE COURT: So he can't use another device?

MR. O'BRIEN: He doesn't have the ability to do that, your Honor. It was written on a piece of paper. It's gone. He doesn't have that.

THE COURT: So if he has a number that was written on a piece of paper he could use another device.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, your Honor. And absolutely I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concede that.

I also am just proffering to the Court that they have seized the ability for him to do that. So in my mind this is the old-fashioned drug case where the government comes in, surprise, knocks on the door, seizes everything in there, the person is left with nothing. That's what I submit is going on here. It's just a different type of scenario.

Now, as to what we would do going forward, I certainly appreciate pretrial's recommendation. And I know under statute, if your Honor is willing to grant release, it should be the least restrictive means. However, I'm also conscious of the fact that the government has raised, in the light most favorable to them, valid points. So what I suggest your Honor do is institute a couple of additional terms and conditions to assure his appearance. Number one, if your Honor is gracious enough to allow him to be released, either he can stay in New York with his mother or he can go to Florida, stay with either his father or an empty house, which would be preferable, that his mother owns, to stay with his wife and his children, his pregnant wife and his children. If that's not acceptable to the Court, Mr. Castro, his father, has agreed to allow him to stay in his home. He has also agreed to be a third-party custodian. He has no pets. There are no firearms. And he does not have a criminal history, outside of, I think there was an arrest for a larceny of some sort 20 years ago that I don't

believe resulted in any actual conviction.

As to an additional third-party custodian, his mother is willing to do that. If your Honor wants two, she is willing to do that.

I took great pains before court today to explain to both that, should Mr. Castro get so much as a speeding ticket, they must call Pretrial Services and they must notify them that he has violated the terms and conditions of his release. They have to act as, essentially, eyes of the Court. They are willing to do that. They are willing to turn their son in, should he so much as just step out of line a little bit. They all understand that, if your Honor requires collateral, requires a secured bond, in whatever amount secured by their properties, that should Mr. Castro not appear, they will lose their homes. The government has the ability to seek them and take them. And they are willing, despite that warning, to offer both of their properties as collateral.

Now, I would point out, Judge, and I think this is worth emphasizing twice, if Mr. Castro loses his home, he has nothing else. If Mrs. Castro loses her moment, she has lost a major part of her retirement and a place to go when she does retire. The home she lives in here in New York is not hers. She rents it. So her, all her eggs are in Florida. So if she loses that home, she too will not have a place to go.

So that's how serious they take this matter. That is

the amount of risk they're willing to accept. And, Judge, I
submit to the Court that, outside of this case and I know
that, on the face of it, it's serious, and I don't dispute
that. But outside of that, this is an individual that appeared
to have some sort of speeding ticket that for whatever reason
escalated into a misdemeanor. I asked my client about the
circumstances of that. He was going 80 miles per hour on the
Hutchinson Parkway going southbound in a 50-miles-per-hour
zone. And it appears he was arrested on a reckless driving,
which evidently, in the State of New York, is a misdemeanor.
He ultimately pled, I believe, to a misdemeanor. That occurred
when he was 25 years old, in 1996. Other than that, nothing.

So I would submit to the Court that this is an individual that can be trusted at this point to abide by any terms and conditions this Court imposes. He is not a danger to the community because whatever, again, in the light most favorable to the government, there is no jury here, whatever he was doing before, it's done. It's over. The gig is up. Everyone is going to be watching him, including his own family.

And, number two, Judge, he has no financial ability.

He can't flee. He doesn't have a passport. He's been out of
the country one time in his entire life. It was in 2011, where
he went on a cruise with his family.

And these are people, again, judge, that understand -- I talked to all of them before court. They understand that,

should he do something stupid, it is their requirement to tell the Court. And they all agreed they would. They all understand it. So does Mr. Castro.

Judge, I submit to the Court that this case will go a lot easier from our perspective — and I know that's not the Court's main concern, but it's a lot easier if I can sit down with Mr. Castro in my office with my investigators and explain to him in person the amount of evidence that's against him. And I believe at that point, Judge, Mr. Castro is probably going to do the right thing. And I don't believe there will be a trial in this matter.

Now, that's not to say that there would be a different result if he's in custody. It's just all that much harder to meet with a client in custody. It's harder to bring electronics in. It's harder to explain things when there's noise and clamoring going on in the back. That is just one factor that I submit to the Court. It's not a main factor. I understand risk of flight and danger to the community are the number one and two factors that this Court is to consider. But I believe at this point, with the collateral, two pieces of collateral, and third-party custodians, and any other term and condition the Court wishes to impose, to include ankle monitoring or GPS monitoring, overcomes the presumption and I believe, Judge, eliminates the risk of flight and the danger to the community. Whatever he was doing, Judge, it's done. He

now is going to face the consequences and attempt to lower his sentence so that when he gets out of prison, his children are not grown. That's the only chance he has.

If the Court has any questions for me, I'd be glad to answer you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. AHMED: Your Honor, may I approach the bench?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Discussion held off the record at the bench)

THE COURT: The Pretrial Services Officer understood your client to have told him that he has access to his funds. So I just want to let you know what I was told here.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, may I respond to a few --

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor. I'll be brief.

Sort of a threshold matter. I don't think anything defense counsel has said has rebutted the presumption in this case. And it is of course a presumption case.

THE COURT: Well, no. I think that's not the right test. Even in a presumption case, the burden of production is on the defendant. Initially, I'm going to find, with the bail package that he's presented, that he's borne that burden. So the burden of persuasion now shifts to the government.

And with respect to danger to the community, you have

the burden of persuasion by clear and convincing evidence. With respect to risk of flight, you have the burden of persuasion by preponderance of the evidence.

MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. I think we've met those standards.

Defense counsel's chief argument is that putting up \$400,000 in equity is enough to protect the community and is enough to assure his client's appearance. And he bases that on his proffer that whatever money Mr. Castro has isn't a lot.

The Pretrial Services report, what he told pretrial about, is that he has \$100,000 in cryptocurrency. That's what it says in the Pretrial Services report.

It also says that he pays \$1800 a month for a Tesla, \$1400 a month for two -- \$1400 each -- for two Camara Revro cars. I'm not sure what those are. \$4500 for a Lamborghini, \$800 for a Range Rover, \$6300 in rent. He has a lot of money. A lot. And maybe the government got some. But who's to know if we got it all?

Here's what we do know. As Ms. Flodr mentioned, we're seeking information from a cryptocurrency exchange based abroad. The defendant is smart. He's sophisticated. He moved money around to multiple cryptocurrency exchanges throughout the world.

He's charged with money laundering. He's trying to conceal where his money came from. And one of the ways to do

that is to put it in places people won't look. And your Honor understood this explicitly. If he knows the password, that's all he needs. He can log in from anywhere and have access to any of it.

Has bitcoin value dropped over the last couple of years? Yes. Is it still substantial? Absolutely.

And of the 1.8 million, how much has been converted into other currencies, or other properties, as the government has alleged here?

And frankly, your Honor, I certainly appreciate that his family is here to support him. They don't understand that he has lived a double life for years, a life in the shadows, in which he has hid, not just from law enforcement but from them, selling drugs secretly, selling drugs behind sophisticated software, VPN blockers, spoofing IP addresses, figuring out ways to hide, figuring out ways to use e-mail accounts that are based in Switzerland so the government can get access to them. He knows what he's doing.

Mr. O'Brien also mentioned a bit about Count Four, the 924(c) charge. Your Honor, let's be clear. If the government executed a search warrant on an individual in the Bronx and they found \$16,000 and a handgun and he was also selling drugs a 924(c) charge would of course have been brought. There's no difference here. The difference is, in addition to \$17,000 in cash, about 6,000 of which was in his car, by the way, \$17,000

in cash in his home, nine guns, he also had precious metals, he also had passwords to bitcoins.

And he may have a license to carry certain guns. Some of the guns were legal. But not all of them. He had an illegal firearm.

THE COURT: Well, the 924(c) doesn't require that the gun be without a permit. Right?

MR. FINKEL: That's absolutely right. What I would submit to the Court is because one of the firearms was illegal, it is more evidence that they were used for illegal purposes. But the Court is correct; even a legal firearm could be used for a 924(c) charge.

So, your Honor, at bottom, I believe the government has shown that there are no circumstances that this defendant, who has access to money that could be accessed anywhere, who has the know-how that he has used, over the period of years, to obey law enforcement, he has the ability to flee. He has the motive to flee. All he's looking for is the opportunity.

And with respect to danger, your Honor, as I mentioned before, there is no condition this Court could impose. We don't know what other drugs he might have hidden. We don't know what else he might be selling, where he would do it. What we know is he can do it. He can do it with just a phone.

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, the prosecutor raised two issues that are new that I didn't have a chance to address. With the

Court's permission, may I briefly address them?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Judge, regarding these cars, they're leases, and those cars have been turned in. Listen, again, I want to keep credibility with the Court. He was doing something illegal and he was doing silly things with that illegal money. That's over. He doesn't have those expenses anymore. He also doesn't have the expense of \$6300 a month for a rental home. He's going to be living with one of his two parents. So that expense is out the window. His experiences are very little.

I just want to go back to the cryptocurrency because it's complicated, it's new. In order to access, it's not just a passcode, like someone would log into their computer to access, you know, the home screen. This, you need two things. You need a bar code, and then you need a 25-character passcode. So you need two different things in order to log in and access this cryptocurrency. My client is not Rain Man. He doesn't have that type of memory. He just doesn't have the ability to access it.

But if the Court is really concerned about it, let's take away his ability to access the Internet. Let's tell his father, if you have Internet in the house, get rid of it. And he also should not have access to any sort of cellphone if the government is concerned about that. And we'll submit to random

searches by Pretrial Services in Orlando. I think that those concerns can be addressed by the concerns that I have proposed to the Court.

So I just wanted to note, Judge, that his expenses are significantly less than they once were, down to almost nothing. And the passcode is not just 2345. I mean, it's a significant passcode that he had to have written down that the government has in their possession. They could log into his account. They could seize his money. And I imagine they're trying to do that right now. And they just probably haven't done it yet. And, again, Judge, I submit that we could take away Internet access, which, his father is nodding up and down saying that he will do that.

So, Judge, again, I think we, the Court found we met our burden, and I don't think the government has overcome it. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. FINKEL: Could I actually just be heard on these three points that defense counsel raised.

The reason, your Honor, that I pointed the Court to the cost of the cars and the house is not to say that those are ongoing expenses. It's to show that, very recently, he was meeting his obligations, which means that he had a lot of access to liquid capital. Whether that was through cryptocurrency, cash, what have you, it shows that he made a lot of money. And I raise that to rebut defense counsel's

assertion that he doesn't have a lot of money. I think the Pretrial Services report rebuts that. That's point number one.

Point number two, there are a lot of ways to access cryptocurrency. One them is what defense counsel mentioned: a long string of passwords that I agree would be very difficult for anyone to memorize. But that's not the only way. You can access cryptocurrency through currency exchanges, which, to log in, require nothing more than a user name and password, just like logging into a Gmail account, your computer itself, anything else. And there very well may be other cryptocurrency accounts the government doesn't know about. And I suspect there are. Because we know that he accessed and used multiple currency exchanges located in multiple countries for multiple different dollar amounts.

And an order from the Court that he can't use a phone or can't access the Internet, your Honor, I submit to you that, frankly in this day and age, that isn't really enforceable. Phones are everywhere. The Internet is everywhere. On the street corner, on virtually every block now in the city is a public terminal in which anyone can access the Internet, log onto a cryptocurrency account, log onto anything else.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

So, as I mentioned, in this presumption case, I find the defendant has met his burden of production, and while the presumption remains in my analysis, the burden shifts to the

government under the standards I already laid out on the record.

The Second Circuit in Mercedes, 254 F.3d 433, has described the process I must go through in addressing this disputed bail application, essentially imposing the burdens I've already described. I should consider the factors set forth in 3142(g). There are four factors. Let me do that now.

The first is, I must consider the nature and circumstances of the crime charged. Here, it's the crimes charged. These are very serious and dangerous crimes that were widespread in their impact across the country, with shipments of extraordinarily dangerous drugs.

The second factor is the weight of the evidence against the defendant. The government has described significant evidence from a variety of sources. There is no ultimate dispute here that it is a strong case against the defendant. And it appears that the government's investigation has only begun, or is continuing, I should say.

The third factor is the history and characteristics of the defendant, including family ties, employment, community ties, and past conduct. There it's a more mixed picture. He has strong family ties. There is a significant presence in the courtroom of many friends and relatives. And they profess their support of the defendant.

In terms of employment, he has no significant

employment history. It appears that he was engaged in this criminal activity and supporting himself and his family, and living a lavish lifestyle and doing so.

Community ties, I think those are strong. He's lived in one place. His children are in school there. He has strong community ties.

Past conduct, there is no serious criminal history record here. The most serious thing about his criminal history record is the bench warrants, which suggest, even though he was facing a misdemeanor, he did abide by his requirements to respect the orders of the Court to appear and respond to those charges.

The fourth factor is the nature and seriousness of the danger to the community or to an individual. I don't think this is hard to assess. The danger here is significant. The danger of the past criminal activity is significant. It was conducted not through the hand deliveries of drugs but through the use of the Internet and co-conspirators apparently. This is the kind of conduct that can occur, if one is released from custody, easily.

So with respect to the issues that I didn't pick up directly in reviewing those four factors, there is a strong motive to flee here, I also think a strong motive to interfere with the government's case, to the extent he has known associates. He is facing a 15-year mandatory minimum term of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

imprisonment. Who knows what the guidelines range will ultimately be, but it's not in dispute that it is at least in that range also of 15 years.

And, you know, it's harder for me to assess the likelihood of flight, because the defendant's ties are so deeply rooted here in New York and in Florida with family members, and it's hard to move your entire family abroad, even while motivated and with lots of money. There are enormous benefits to living in America, I like to think, I think we all think. So that's a tough decision to separate one's self and one's family and uproot them if they come with you.

But in terms of danger to the community, I find the government has met its burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that a significant danger continues to exist. This was extraordinarily dangerous activity. Lives were at stake from use of these dangerous drugs. And so I am going to remand the defendant.

Mr. O'Brien, is there anything else we need do? MR. O'BRIEN: No, your Honor. That concludes my business before the Court.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Flodr?

MS. FLODR: Nothing else, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Adjourned)